

Manuscript: “**Caractérisation De Quelques Légumes-Feuilles Les Plus Consommés Dans La Ville De Daloa (Centre-Ouest, Côte d’Ivoire)**”

Submitted: 29 October 2020

Accepted: 03 December 2020

Published: 31 December 2020

Corresponding Author: Yao N’zué Benjamin

Doi: 10.19044/esj.2020.v16n36p257

Peer review:

Reviewer 1: Blinded

Reviewer 2: Kouame Konan,
Peleforo Gon Coulibaly University of Korhogo, Ivory Coast

Reviewer 3: Blinded

ESJ Manuscript Evaluation Form 2020

This form is designed to summarize the manuscript peer review that you have completed and to ensure that you have considered all appropriate criteria in your review. Your review should provide a clear statement, to the authors and editors, of the modifications necessary before the paper can be published or the specific reasons for rejection.

Please respond within the appointed time so that we can give the authors timely responses and feedback.

NOTE: ESJ promotes peer review procedure based on scientific validity and technical quality of the paper (not perceived the impact). You are also not required to do proofreading of the paper. It could be recommended as part of the revision.
ESJ editorial office would like to express its special gratitude for your time and efforts. Our editorial team is a substantial reason that stands ESJ out from the crowd!

Date Manuscript Received: 06/11/2020	Date Review Report Submitted:

Manuscript Title: Caractérisation de quelques légumes-feuilles les plus consommés dans la ville de Daloa (Centre-ouest, Côte d'Ivoire).
ESJ Manuscript Number: 1029/20
You agree your name is revealed to the author of the paper: No
You approve, your name as a reviewer of this paper, is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes
You approve, this review report is available in the "review history" of the paper: Yes

Evaluation Criteria:

Please give each evaluation item a numeric rating on a 5-point scale, along with a thorough explanation for each point rating.

<i>Questions</i>	<i>Rating Result</i> [Poor] 1-5 [Excellent]
1. The title is clear and it is adequate to the content of the article.	3
<i>(The title does not stick to the content of the document. This is not a characterization but a determination of chemical and biochemical constituent.)</i>	
2. The abstract clearly presents objects, methods and results.	3
<i>(The abstract does not clearly outline the objectives of the work. The methodology of the survey is not explained. The abstract contains too many values so you have to reduce it. The abstract is too long so we have to reduce. Keywords: there are too many keywords so you have to reduce it to 5 or 6 words.)</i>	
3. There are few grammatical errors and spelling mistakes in this article.	4
<i>(There are fewer grammar and vocabulary mistakes)</i>	
4. The study methods are explained clearly.	3
<i>(The methodologies used for the analyses have been well explained but the survey methodology is not clearly explained.)</i>	
5. The body of the paper is clear and does not contain errors.	3.5
<i>(The paper contains all the different parts and contains few errors)</i>	

6. The conclusions or summary are accurate and supported by the content.	3
<i>(The conclusion is not appropriate to the document. He has to go back to the conclusion.t)</i>	
7. The references are comprehensive and appropriate.	4
<i>(The references are comprehensive and are clearly written, there are a few mistakes.)</i>	

Overall Recommendation (mark an X with your recommendation) :

Accepted, no revision needed	
Accepted, minor revision needed	X
Return for major revision and resubmission	
Reject	

Comments and Suggestions to the Author(s):

Author must take into account these observations to improve the document